

1 **Approved 12.06.2021**

2 **Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel (NDCAP)**

3 **Monday, September 20, 2021**

4 **Microsoft Teams Webcast**

5 **Physical Meeting Space at Epsilon Spires Social Engagement Room,**

6 **190 Main Street, Brattleboro, VT 05301**

7 **Meeting Minutes**

8  
9 VT NDCAP Members Present (via webcast):

- 10 • **Emily Davis**, *Citizen Appointee of former Senate President Pro Tempore Tim Ashe, Panel*
- 11 *Chair*
- 12 • **June Tierney**, *Commissioner of Public Service, ex officio*
- 13 • **Lissa Weinmann** (*Brattleboro*), *Citizen Appointee of Senate President Pro Tempore Becca*
- 14 *Balint, VT NDCAP Federal Nuclear Waste Policy Committee Chair*
- 15 • **Madeline Arms**, *Representative for the Town of Vernon*
- 16 • **VT State Representative Sara Coffey** (*Guilford*), *Citizen Appointee of former Speaker of*
- 17 *the House Mitzi Johnson (joined webcast at ~6:13 PM after a connectivity issue)*
- 18 • **Trish Coppolino**, *Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Waste Management*
- 19 *and Prevention Division Environmental Program Manager, Designee for the Secretary of*
- 20 *Natural Resources (joined webcast at ~6:04 PM after a connectivity issue)*
- 21 • **Corey Daniels**, *Senior ISFSI Manager, NorthStar Vermont Yankee*
- 22 • **Dr. Bill Irwin**, *Radiological & Toxicological Sciences Program Chief, Designee for the*
- 23 *Secretary of Human Services (joined webcast at ~6:06 PM, during roll call)*
- 24 • **Brett Long**, *Deputy Commissioner of Economic Development, Designee for the Secretary*
- 25 *of Commerce and Community Development*
- 26 • **David Pearson**, *Vice-President and Regional Manager, NorthStar Group Services*

27  
28 VT NDCAP Members Present at meeting site:

- 29 • **Josh Unruh**, *Citizen Appointee of Governor Phil Scott, Panel Vice-Chair*
- 30 • **Bob Leach**, *Citizen Appointee of Governor Phil Scott*
- 31 • **VT State Senator Mark MacDonald**, *Member of the Senate Committee on Natural*
- 32 *Resources and Energy*

33  
34 The following NDCAP members were absent from the meeting:

- 35 • **Chris Campany**, *Executive Director of the Windham Regional Commission (WRC)*
- 36 • **Marvin Resnikoff**, *Citizen Appointee of former Speaker of the House Mitzi Johnson*
- 37 • **VT State Representative Laura Sibilia**, *Member of the House Committee on Energy &*
- 38 *Technology*
- 39 • **MA State Representative Paul Mark** (*Peru, MA*), *representing the Towns of Bernardston,*
- 40 *Colrain, Gill, Greenfield, Leyden, Northfield, and Warwick, Massachusetts, appointee of*
- 41 *former MA Governor Deval Patrick*

1 There are currently two vacancies on the Panel.

2  
3 With 3 Panelists at the meeting site, 7 Panelists connected via the Teams webcast (and 3 more Panelists  
4 joining the webcast shortly thereafter), a quorum was present (9 Panelists required). Approximately 18  
5 members of the public (and 7 staff members associated with the Panel) connected to the webcast.  
6 Excluding 1 State Employee (Nuclear Engineer Tony Leshinskie) and two Brattleboro Community  
7 Television (BCTV) technicians, no members of the public were present at the meeting site.

8  
9 The meeting was called to order at 6:01 PM; a recording of the meeting webcast is available online at  
10 <http://publicservice.vermont.gov/electric/ndcap> and at  
11 [https://www.brattleborotv.org/vt-nuclear-decommissioning-citizens-advisory-panel/vt-ndcap-92021-](https://www.brattleborotv.org/vt-nuclear-decommissioning-citizens-advisory-panel/vt-ndcap-92021-mtg)  
12 [mtg](https://www.brattleborotv.org/vt-nuclear-decommissioning-citizens-advisory-panel/vt-ndcap-92021-mtg).

### 14 **Welcome, Opening Remarks & Overview of Meeting Agenda:**

15 The Chair, Emily Davis, welcomed everyone for the meeting, noting that this was the first Panel meeting  
16 with a required physical meeting space in well over a year. She noted that the order of tonight's  
17 business was a bit different than previous Panel meetings. A roll call was taken to identify Panel  
18 members on the webcast and in the meeting room. The Panel members present briefly introduced  
19 themselves. Lissa Weinmann noted that she had been recently reappointed to the Panel by Senate  
20 President Pro Tempore Becca Balint.

21  
22 **Amendments to the Meeting Agenda:** None made or suggested. A copy of the meeting agenda is  
23 available at <https://publicservice.vermont.gov/content/meeting-agenda-9-20-2021>.

24  
25 **Approval of Meeting Minutes:** The June 14, 2021 meeting minutes were reviewed. One minor  
26 correction to the minutes was requested by the Chair:

27 - on Page 3, Line 6, change "indicate" to "indicative."

28  
29 A motion to approve the June 14 minutes as amended was made by Corey Daniels and seconded by  
30 Maddy Arms. The amended minutes were approved by voice vote with two abstentions (Mark  
31 MacDonald & Josh Unruh) and no nays heard.

### 33 **Texas Low Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact (TLLRWDC) Commission Report**

34 *The TLLRWDC Commission's presentation begins at 0:09:58 in the meeting video.*

35 TLLRWDC Compact Commissioner Peter Bradford, one of Vermont's two Commissioners for the  
36 TLLRWDC, outlined the Compact's history and purpose. An overview of the Compact's Low Level  
37 Radioactive Waste (LLRW) Disposal Facility and its operations was provided. The slides for this  
38 presentation are available at: <https://publicservice.vermont.gov/electric/ndcap> in the "Meeting of  
39 September 20, 2021" section.

40  
41 A brief history on the creation of the TLLRWDC and the founding of its Andrews County, TX disposal  
42 facility was provided. TLLRWDC responsibilities include managing the disposal facility's capacity and  
43 assuring that Vermont's (and Texas') required capacity for its low level radwaste remains available. A  
44 major part of the capacity management is authorizing waste disposal requests from non-compact states.

1 It was noted that the safety and environmental impacts of the disposal facility are the responsibility of  
2 the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ). The September 13 NRC approval for a  
3 proposed Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility in Andrews County, TX and its formal  
4 opposition by Texas and New Mexico was briefly outlined. This situation has set up a challenge for State  
5 versus Federal jurisdictions in this matter. Commissioner Bradford indicated that the operation of a  
6 spent fuel storage facility would be outside the jurisdiction of the TLLRWDC Commission. Accordingly,  
7 the Commission has not stated an opinion on the Consolidated Interim Spent Fuel Storage Facility.

8  
9 It was noted that the Compact's Low Level Radioactive Waste (LLRW) Disposal Facility and its operator,  
10 WCS, has undergone some financial difficulties in recent years. However, based on Commission  
11 assessments, it is likely that the Disposal Facility and WCS will continue to remain operable and available  
12 to accept all low-level radioactive waste from Vermont Yankee's decommissioning.

### 13 14 **Panelist Questions on TLLRWDC Commission Report**

15 *Panelist questions on the TLLRWDC Commission presentation begin at 0:44:58 on the meeting video.*  
16

17 In response to several questions VT Senator Mark MacDonald and VT Representative Sara Coffey,  
18 Commissioner Bradford elaborated on the radwaste disposal practice of down-blend and the financial  
19 issues that the Disposal Facility faced.

20  
21 Down-blend combines small amounts of Class B low level waste with much larger quantities of Class A  
22 waste, such that the combined waste package qualifies as Class A waste, which is easier and less  
23 expensive to dispose of. There are several licensed waste facilities that can accept Class A waste. The  
24 TLLRWDC facility is the only NRC-licensed facility for Class B and C radwaste.

25  
26 Changes in nuclear power industry economics brought on by the availability of cheap domestic natural  
27 gas radically altered the radwaste streams expected when the TLLRWDC facility first opened. Fewer  
28 nuclear power plants are operating (fewer low level waste sources). Many of the operating facilities  
29 have found it to be cheaper to store their low-level waste onsite rather than shipping and disposing of it  
30 at a low level waste facility.

31  
32 The Commissioner further noted that while onsite storage is safe, the value of consolidating radwaste  
33 storage is that a dedicated storage facility can be operated more safely and more efficiently than  
34 individual smaller facilities.

35  
36 To assist with a time constraint, the Panel Chair allowed Kevin Kamps (of Beyond Nuclear) to provide  
37 comments during this Panelist Q&A period. *Mr. Kamps' comments begin at 0:55:30 on the meeting*  
38 *video.*

39  
40 Mr. Kamps noted the recent NRC license approval for construction and operation of a Consolidated  
41 Interim Spent Fuel Storage site in Andrews County, TX. He indicated that his organization, Beyond  
42 Nuclear, along with a consortium of groups such as the Sierra Club and the Permian Basin Land and  
43 Royalty Owners Association will undertake legal challenges to the facility's approval. Texas and New  
44 Mexico, writ large, do not consent to Interim Storage, with several authorities such as the Governors'  
45 Offices and the Texas Legislature on record as actively opposing. Andrews County already serves as a

1 low -level radioactive waste dumping ground. It should not be burdened with high-level radioactive  
2 waste. Mr. Kamps noted that part of this approval process was fed by NDCAP's support of Interim  
3 Storage several years ago, adding that Vermont Congress Peter Welch actively campaigned for Interim  
4 Storage because of NDCAP's support. Mr. Kamps appealed to the Panel to rescind its stated support for  
5 Interim Storage.

6  
7 At the conclusion of Mr. Kamps' comments, Panel Chair Emily Davis noted that the Panel's position on  
8 Interim Storage was rescinded by an 8 to 1 vote in a previous meeting. The Panel currently has no policy  
9 on any changes to the nuclear waste issue.

10  
11 *Panelist questions on the TLLRWDC Commission presentation resume at 1:03:15 on the meeting video.*

12  
13 Lissa Weinmann asked two questions: 1) what is your, or the Compact Commission's, position on the  
14 NRC reconsidering its classifications for Greater-Than-Class C waste? If the NRC allowed it, would the  
15 Compact facility be able to accept Greater-Than-Class C waste? 2) Is it possible for the Federal  
16 government to override public dissent because the NRC has issued a license for an interim disposal  
17 facility?

18  
19 In response to the first question, Commissioner Bradford stated that the Compact Commission has not  
20 taken a position on radwaste reclassification. The Compact Facility was built to take Class B and C  
21 waste. The waste classifications are a legal matter not in the purview of the Compact Commission. It is  
22 up to the TCEQ and the Texas Legislature to determine what is allowed at the Facility because it's a  
23 Texas environmental impact question. Were this question to impact the Facility's ability to take  
24 Vermont Yankee's low-level waste, then it would become an issue of concern for the Compact  
25 Commission. The Commissioner further noted, that while not a legal opinion, he believes that anything  
26 classified into Class C waste is probably acceptable at the facility under its current license conditions.  
27 However, the Texas Attorney General's Office may have a different position.

28  
29 For the second question, Commissioner Bradford stated that the litigation over whether Vermont's  
30 Legislature mandating Vermont Yankee's closure may have addressed this. The ruling in that case  
31 reflects that the Atomic Energy Act preempts radiological health and safety matters. If radwaste  
32 facilities are structured (legally) the same way for power plants, there's a strong likelihood that the  
33 Federal government will believe that it can override Texas and New Mexico objections. There may be  
34 other factors, such as economic impacts to consider.

### 35 36 **Public Questions on TLLRWDC Commission Report**

37 *Public questions on the TLLRWDC Commission presentation begin at 1:09:33 on the meeting video.*

38  
39 Chris Williams (Citizens Awareness Network, Brattleboro, VT) noted that while he had had several  
40 questions for Commissioner Bradford, they had been addressed by the responses to Lissa Weinmann's  
41 questions.

42  
43 Debra Stoleroff (Plainfield, VT, VT Yankee Decommissioning Alliance) had several questions:  
44 Have any of the Compact Commissioners ever been people of color, or from marginalized communities  
45 or "working class folks?"

Commissioner Bradford replied that one of the commissioners is a judge from Andrews County; this may be a requirement under Texas law. The Commissioner knows nothing about the judge's income. There was one previous commissioner who was African American. The ethnicity of the several Compact Commissioners has never been discussed. Currently, Commissioner Bradford knows of no (ethnic) minority members among the Commission.

Ms. Stoleroff's second question: If there was a scientifically sound radwaste storage facility in Vermont that could conceivably receive high level radwaste from across the country, would you support it?

In response, Commissioner Bradford noted that he once lived within 5 miles of Maine Yankee when it was an operating reactor. He's always regarded operating plants as greater radiological risks than waste repositories. He additionally noted that he never felt threatened by the risk of the de facto high level radwaste repository at West Valley, NY while that was under his regulatory jurisdiction. He generally regards dedicated, consolidated waste facilities to be safer than de facto or former power plant storage facilities because the consolidated facilities are purposely sited and constructed for their storage purpose. Storage at power plants and sites such as West Valley were never intended for indefinite storage.

### **Federal Nuclear Waste Policy Committee Activities Report**

*This discussion begins at 1:20:11 in the meeting video.*

Lissa Weinmann, Chair of the Panel's Federal Nuclear Waste Policy Committee, outlined the draft report that the Committee recently published on the on the Panel website. A preliminary version of the report is available at: <https://publicservice.vermont.gov/electric/ndcap> in the "Meeting of September 20, 2021" section. The Committee met earlier this afternoon and added several more items to report. This revised version is also available from the Panel website. Additional materials (background for the report) is available on the following webpage:

<https://publicservice.vermont.gov/content/vt-ndcap-federal-nuclear-waste-policy>.

The report summarizes many of the items that the Committee has examined thus far and discussions that have occurred at its monthly meetings. The Committee is requesting that Panel members review the draft and provide feedback to the Committee. There are a lot of topics covered.

The floor was opened to Panelist questions on the draft report; none were received.

### **Public Questions on Federal Nuclear Waste Policy Committee Activities**

*Public questions / comments regarding the Committee Report begin at 1:23:33 in the meeting video.*

Anne Darling (Easthampton, MA): noted that several members of the public, including herself, attended the Committee's meeting earlier in the day and provided comments on the draft report at that time. She thanked the Committee for its efforts in creating the report.

Lissa Weinmann additionally noted that the draft report highlights several potential topics where common ground among the Panelists is possible for an Advisory Opinion. One such topic could be restoring contributions to Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund (tax collection on nuclear-produced electricity).

1 The Department of Energy estimates it will need ~\$100 billion for interim storage facilities and a  
2 permanent repository, but contributions to the Fund were suspended by a 2013 court order. The Fund  
3 is way short of that figure.

4  
5 Additionally, the Panel may want to support the new US House Caucus for spent nuclear fuel solutions.  
6 There needs to be a restart on a national integrated spent fuel management system and a  
7 reexamination of what a deep geological repository requires. Currently, there are no such repositories  
8 operating anywhere worldwide, although Finland and China both appear close to opening one.

9  
10 The Committee hopes to have an Advisory Opinion or two for consideration by the end of the year.

11  
12 Emily Davis noted that the Committee considered a proposal to create a new federal entity charged with  
13 spent fuel management, and asked how that connected to the work locally, and to the Panel. Lissa  
14 Weinmann responded that so long as the status quo is maintained nationally, the fuel will remain in  
15 Vernon and nothing will change.

### 16 17 **Early General Public Comments**

18 *This portion of Public Questions / Comments begins at 1:30:11 in the meeting video.*

19  
20 Schuyler Gould (Citizens Awareness Network, Brattleboro, VT) asked Commissioner Bradford whether he  
21 saw a contradiction in the NRC approving an Interim Storage Facility license when the underlying law  
22 requires that interim storage cannot move forward without a permanent repository being identified.

23  
24 Commissioner Bradford responded that, as a former NRC Commissioner, he does not believe that the  
25 NRC would license a facility that could not legally be built or operated. Interim Storage has always been  
26 intertwined with selecting and licensing a permanent repository, which we still do not have. Interim  
27 Storage is seen as a means of taking pressure off developing a permanent repository right away. The  
28 legislation in the 80s and 90s did prohibit the Federal government from pursuing interim storage  
29 without a permanent repository. However, the Blue Ribbon Commission did not endorse the selection  
30 of Yucca Mountain as the permanent repository and called for a rethinking of a long term disposal site.  
31 Interim Storage does not satisfy this rethinking, but does move the process along.

### 32 33 **NorthStar Update on VY Site Decommissioning Activities**

34 *NorthStar's presentation begins at 1:35:45 in the meeting video.*

35 Panel Member Corey Daniels, NorthStar Senior ISFSI (spent fuel storage) Manager at Vermont Yankee,  
36 presented a summary of recent site decommissioning activities. The slides for this presentation are  
37 available at: <https://publicservice.vermont.gov/electric/ndcap> in the "Meeting of September 20, 2021"  
38 section.

39  
40 NorthStar has reached over 1,000,000 person hours without an OSHA Recordable Lost Time Accident  
41 since starting decommissioning work in January 2019. (It was noted that the presentation reports an  
42 older figure of 800,000 person hours.) The project goal continues to be to complete the project with  
43 zero Lost Time Accidents. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued no cited violations, nor  
44 have there been any non-cited violations, for the decommissioning project in either 2019 or 2020.  
45 There have been no cited or non-cited violations thus far in 2021.



Progress on Reactor Vessel (RV) segmentation and the ongoing dismantling of the Turbine Building was described. Removal of RV internal components is essentially complete. Preparations for RV nozzle cutting and segmentation of the RV itself have begun. Overall, the decommissioning project remains ahead of schedule. It is expected that demolition of the Reactor Building itself will commence next year.

Clearing of Turbine Building equipment continues. Recent additional structure demolitions were also described, including demolition of the Effluent Stack, component removals at the River Intake Structure and the demolition of the remaining onsite radwaste processing and other system tanks. A walk-through of a radwaste transfer from the Reactor Building to shipment offsite via a dedicated railcar was also described.

Thus far this year, 106 radwaste shipments (89 railcars and 17 trucks) have been sent to WCS facilities. 320 radwaste shipments have occurred since the start of decommissioning project. VY continues to average 3 railcar shipments occur per week, and about 13 shipments per month.

NorthStar continues steady progress in onsite non-radiological clean-up and continues to work with the Agency of Natural Resources on additional corrective action plans. No new contaminated areas have been identified onsite. A risk assessment plan for non-radiological contaminants remains under Natural Resources and Health Departments review. Groundwater from the site's several diversion wells is being discharged to the Connecticut River in accordance with the river discharge permit recently approved by the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC). Discharges are typically 15,000 gallons per day.

#### **State Agencies' Updates on VY Decommissioning**

*These presentations begin at 1:50:58 in the meeting video.*

#### **Agency of Natural Resources (ANR) / Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Project Update**

Gerold Noyes from ANR / DEC Waste Management Division provided this update. The slides for this presentation are available at: <https://publicservice.vermont.gov/electric/ndcap> in the "Meeting of September 20, 2021" section.

DEC's ongoing interactions with VT Yankee were outlined (regular status calls, draft permit and corrective action plan reviews). Quarterly groundwater sampling for non-radiological contaminants continue to show no area-wide contamination issues at the VY site. The next sampling is scheduled for September 22. A public meeting (webcast) will be held on September 22 for public information and comments on an alteration to the site's potable water permit.

ANR continues to work closely with NorthStar's remediation contractor, Haley & Aldrich, on planning to address potential contaminant issues in previously identified Areas of Concern (AOCs). This includes reviewing post-demolition sampling plans and previously submitted remediations for the AOCs. No new contamination areas (including potential PCB contaminations) have been found onsite; however more sampling will be done as more site structures are demolished, allowing more areas to be sampled. No additional asbestos abatement work has occurred; onsite asbestos abatement is largely complete.

## **Public Service Department (PSD) Project Update**

Eric Guzman, PSD Special Counsel (staff attorney) made this presentation. Nick Capik of Four Points Group (FPG), PSD's consultants for overseeing the financial and technical details of VT Yankee's Decommissioning, was also present to provide additional details as needed. The slides for this presentation are available at: <https://publicservice.vermont.gov/electric/ndcap> in the "Meeting of September 20, 2021" section. *The PSD presentation begins at 1:58:44 in the meeting video.*

PSD's financial and technical oversight role was outlined, which includes updates on work complete versus work remaining and project expenditures versus funds remaining. PSD coordinates with other State Agencies and FPG to assess project status and whether the trust fund reimbursement requests are consistent with the work completed. PSD also meets with NorthStar regularly to conduct any follow-up necessary on NorthStar's self-reporting. Regular site visits by FPG are conducted to observe completed work. The most recent visit was in early August. These visits continue to show that project progress is consistent with that described in NorthStar's most recent status reports. NorthStar remains on track to complete the project with the currently available funding.

It was noted that the Vermont Yankee indirect license transfer case before the Vermont Public Utilities Commission is currently stayed until October at the Petitioner's (NorthStar ownership) request.

Nuclear Decommissioning Trust (NDT) and Site Restoration Trust (SRT) fund balances and disbursements between May 6 and September 1 were provided. As of August 31, the NDT balance is roughly \$307.7 million; the SRT balance is roughly \$58.8 million. All fund disbursements are for work already completed.

**Additional State Agency Reports:** Panelist Dr. Bill Irwin indicated that Vermont Department of Health had no report at this time.

## **Panelist Questions on NorthStar and State Agencies' Reports**

*Panelist questions on these presentations begin at 2:04:50 on the meeting video.*

Lissa Weinmann asked whether all underground piping at site had been removed yet.

In response, Corey Daniels said no. Additional piping removal would be addressed when it is reasonable to do so as part of other demolition tasks. To date, the bulk of piping removals have been from the interior of the Turbine Building. The Turbine Building needs to be taken "cold and dark" to assure that underground piping and other large below grade components can be removed safely. Portions of the Turbine and Reactor Buildings that still require electricity need to be transferred to "street power" (i.e., the local power grid) before these removals can start. Efforts for this transition have begun.

Lissa Weinmann also asked about the status of Department of Energy damages that NorthStar claims for spent fuel storage expenses and the status of the compensation agreement with the Town of Vernon.

## **Public Questions on NorthStar and State Agencies' Reports**

No public questions or comments were made at this time.



## **Potential Panel Budget Uses Discussion**

*Comments begin at 2:14:27 on the meeting video.*

Panel Chair Emily Davis provided a preliminary breakdown of potential uses for the Panel's \$35,000 annual budget for the 2022. Much of the initial budget uses would cover meeting logistics such as meeting space rental, video recording, transcription services (minutes generation) and administrative staffing to help with meeting promotion (press releases, social media, etc.) Additional budget uses would be for a meeting infrastructure investment: obtaining a better projector for meeting presentations and a potential upgrade for the Panel website. An appropriation for Panel Education (e.g., attending a relevant conference or professional speaker fees) is also included. Details of the draft budget are available at: <https://publicservice.vermont.gov/content/2022-proposed-ndcap-budget>.

It was noted that many of the administrative budget items were created as a means of alleviating the State Nuclear Engineer's (Tony Leshinskie's) workload in providing Panel support. Sara Coffey requested that Tony's support of the Panel not be eliminated. His expertise will still be needed in activities such as creating and publishing the Panel's Annual Report. In response, Tony Leshinskie noted that he regards much of his administrative work for the Panel as Project Management. He would still be responsible for assuring that these activities are properly carried out for the Panel even if they were done by other staff.

Public Service Commissioner June Tierney noted that staffing issues for the Panel fall under the purview of the Public Service Department. The budget item for the State Nuclear Engineer's time does not need to be included in the Panel budget, since that is part of the Department's budget. Panel staffing would need to run through the Department as well.

Some discussion on increasing stipends for what is essentially volunteer work by the citizen appointees to the Panel occurred. It was noted by several Panelists (e.g., June Tierney and Josh Unruh) that the stipends were established in the legislation creating the Panel. Hence, legislation would be needed to expand or revise the stipends.

Josh Unruh suggested that the staffing items in the proposed budget could instead be used for professional consultations to benefit / educate the Panel. Josh sees three key uses for the Panel budget: Professional Consultation, Panel Education and Expanding Community Involvement with the Panel.

Lissa Weinmann suggested that some of the budget could also be used for establishing an internship for the Panel to pursue investigations into specific topics.

Several Panelists, including Sara Coffey and Josh Unruh, supported enhancing the Panel's website. Sara noted that there are several other Decommissioning Panels that have websites that she regards as more user-friendly. Josh suggested that the answer may be for the Panel to have a website independent of the Public Service Department website.

Tony Leshinskie reminded the Panel that most other Citizen Advisory Panel's are created and managed by the NRC licensees for the decommissioning facilities. The Vermont NDCAP is one of the few created by state law. Accordingly, there are some restrictions that a state-established panel has that other panels do not.

1 June Tierney noted that the Panel, by law, is administered by the Public Service Department. The Panel  
2 website is subject to Vermont State Standards as a result. The Panel should consider forming a  
3 committee to help revise the Panel website, but the Panel website is required to remain part of the  
4 Department's website.

5  
6 Lissa Weinmann noted that increased social outreach by the Panel may be the real need. She also asked  
7 how a Panelist would go about requesting funding to attend a conference. June Tierney and Josh Unruh  
8 noted that the method for this would need to be investigated.

9  
10 June Tierney reminded the Panel that its primary mission is to provide a citizen voice during Vermont  
11 Yankee's decommissioning. We need to be careful to avoid "mission creep" in its purpose.

12  
13 Senator Mark MacDonald requested a reminder on the Panel's mission: who is the Panel supposed to  
14 advise? In response, Emily Davis read out the Panel duties described in legislation establishing the Panel  
15 (18 VSA §1701). Senator MacDonald observed that a key to any advice from the Panel is to address who  
16 is responsible for paying for completing decommissioning once current decommissioning funds are  
17 spent.

18  
19 In response, June Tierney noted that Representative Laura Sibilio had asked the Department similar  
20 questions several years ago. In response, a letter was published (based Department legal staff research)  
21 outlining payment responsibilities. The letter is likely not a completely satisfactory answer, but it is the  
22 currently available answer. This letter is available on the Panel website at the following link:

23  
24 [https://publicservice.vermont.gov/content/commissioner-tierney-letter-representative-sibilio-](https://publicservice.vermont.gov/content/commissioner-tierney-letter-representative-sibilio-regarding-vermont-yankee-decommissioning)  
25 [regarding-vermont-yankee-decommissioning](https://publicservice.vermont.gov/content/commissioner-tierney-letter-representative-sibilio-regarding-vermont-yankee-decommissioning)

26  
27 Emily Davis concluded the budget discussion by requesting for any additional Panelist feedback via  
28 email. She will work on finalizing the budget for a vote at the December 6 Panel meeting.

### 29 30 **General Public Comments to the Panel**

31 *Comments begin at 3:07:24 on the meeting video.*

32  
33 Anne Darling (Easthampton, MA): indicated that she was willing to assist in promoting the Panel. More  
34 promotion is needed to increase public attendance beyond the few die-hards who continue to attend.

35  
36 **Meeting Wrap-Up:** Tony Leshinskie requested that anyone who experienced difficulties connecting to  
37 the meeting webcast should contact him through the Panel email address: [PSD.NDCAP@vermont.gov](mailto:PSD.NDCAP@vermont.gov) to  
38 provide details on their experience. He has several issues that he needs to discuss with Microsoft  
39 regarding the Teams platform. Tony also noted that the next Full Panel meeting is scheduled for  
40 December 6; further details to be announced. The Panel's Federal Nuclear Waste Policy Committee  
41 continues to meet monthly. Their next meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 18, from 1 PM to  
42 2 PM.

43  
44 **MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:09 PM.**